App. F. IX-4

Previous References
Hyd 37. 30-12-18.

1934.
(Hyd.)

File No. 25-34
Serial Nos. 10—12

Letter References.
Hyd 47-35—1-2

PRESERVED

37

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. Three

Part B for Hyd '35

SUBJECT.

Suspension of the Bus Inspector of the Shimoga Dist.

12). To

The D. C. Shimoga
Comptr.
Dir of I & C.

WD 03607—GPB—22,500—2-8-35

NO-P 1430—2 dy 28-8-35.

Approves of the recommendation made by the D. C. Shimoga to Confirm the period of Suspension from 16th April to 30th May 35— as a Specific punishment—and the officer given a chance to improve himself.

B. Rama Rao
5-12-35

Newspaper Abstract.

Shimoga News. Navajivana 29.4.35

A. | " Learns that the Bus Inspector Shimoga has been suspended on a charge of corruption and wants to know the truth o this fact. Requests the Dy. Commissioner Shimoga to make detailed ~~enquiries~~ investigation in this affair."

Asst. Secy's Remarks on P.W.D.

1) " What ~~is this~~ about A."

Draft calling for a report subd.

2/2-5-35

2)

3) The Dt Mgte recommends for the transfer of the Bus Inspector Shimoga on account of 1) Inordinate delay in issuing Brake certificates and 2) on chance of having received

TYPING SECTION. 2. MAY 1935 GENL & REV. SECTT.

10 | Letter no A4.P.182/34.35 from the Dy Shimoga forwarding his report on the alleged charge of corruption against the Bus Inspector of Shimoga this consequential suspension published in the Navajeevana paper of 29.4.35

6948 of 34

File No. of 193 . General and Revenue Secretariat

illegal gratification made by certain bus proprietors.

(4) On receipt of information of the above charges the Dist magte immediately placed the Bus Inspector under suspension from 16.4.35 who was permitted to enter on duty on 30.5.35 and the Dt magte now suggests that the order by which the Bus Inspector was placed under suspension from 16.4.35 to 30.5.35 by him may now be confirmed by Govt, and the Inspector transferred from the Shimoga Dist. Submd for orders.

by 10/6 N.R.K.

5) Please put up the file relating to the Bus Inspector of Bangalore against whom an anonymous petition was received recently -

File Called. (Receipt 5-34) by 10/6

pre 10/6.

6) Where is "the brief summary of evidence recorded" referred to at A in the P.U.D.? The enquiry seems to have been held in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the Public Servants' Conduct Rules, and therefore please ask the D.C about the confidential report of the enquiry and the findings

GENERAL DEPT. 21 JUNE 19.. 364

Serial No.

of the enquiring officer upon each of the articles of charge, which he has to give as per para 228 of the Manual of Secretariat Circulars and Standing orders (Part I) 19

mc 17/6/35

7) Draft submitted 8) Issued Necessary

18/6/35 mc 18/6

TYPING BRANCH 18 JUN 1935 GENL & REV. SECTT. 4-30

11 Issued no P 7000 dt 18.6.35 to the Shimoga calling for certain particulars

4) Recommitted.

20/6/35

10) For perusal (See Secy) mc 21/6

29/6

mc 1/7

No. A4.P.182/34.35 dt 28.6.35 from the Dist. Shimoga forwarding a brief summary of evidence recorded by the enquiry officer stating that it is the same as the Confidential report of the enquiring officer & contains the findings of each of the allegations.

11) The facts of the case are briefly as follows:-

12) Mr. Pandala who was Bus inspector at Mysore for over three years transferred to Shimoga in October 1934 in place of Mr. Narasarayan posted to Mysore.

13) A report appeared in the Navajeevana of 29.4.1935 that the Bus Inspector of Shimoga has been suspended on a charge of Corruption on this the attention of the Govt Shimoga was invited & a report was called for on 4.5.1935.

14) On 5.6.1935 the Govt Shimoga forwarded a detailed report in the matter (P.W.D). The Govt states that he was suspended twice on 16.4.35 on the strength of two complaints dt 10.4.35 & 16.4.35. One complaint was made by Mr. [redacted] of Bus certificates and his having received illegal gratification from some of the Bus owners. The Govt further directed a departmental enquiry by the Personal Asst. The records in connection to the enquiry have been

received. They go to show that on the strength of the allegations made in the petitions (two) ten persons including the petitioners were examined. An analysis of the witnesses goes to show that they were really four being Sri Sait (the petitioner) & his two clerks, one Sitharamayya (another petitioner) & his clerk, one Sathagiri Rao & his clerk and one Rahim Bee & his two clerks.

18) The first petitioner has spoken to the delay in granting a permit in respect of a bus examined on 10.4.85. He relies on the statements of his clerks. He avers that he is not acquainted with the bus inspector nor has he seen. His two clerks speak to the fact that the Bus Inspector delayed granting a permit in respect of a lorry which he inspected & which they allege was passed.

16) One Sitharamayya has stated in his petition of 16.4.85 that when he examined the accounts books in his office he found

money ~~order~~ on 27-2-35 ~~by Rs 10/-~~ as payment made to Bus Inspector & paid by his clerk who also reported ~~had~~ when ~~the clerk~~ to the Inspector and the bus a few days previously the Bus Inspector postponed certifying from day to day pending similar payment. his clerk Ramanna Rao pleads to the effect.

17) One Seshagiriappa in whose account books a similar entry was detected states that the entry represents the expenditure incurred in going etc & pleasure for attending equipment & personal comforts.

18) One Rahim Beig has stated that on 6.2.35 he made a payment of Rs 10/- to the Inspector as mamool in the office & he is supported by his two clerks who agree to having paid the amounts Rahim Beig ~~...~~ on 8.5.35 Charges were framed

19) One Ramulu filed a statement on 27.5.35 (Ex Dy-d) and requested reinstatement being innocent of ... the charges and

on 30th may he was permitted to join office from that day.

20) The Sub'o Summary of the evidence is at para 4 of his letter. He has come to the view that the Asst Inspector has given room for complaint of a serious nature. He therefore recommends that it will be sufficient if the period of suspension is confirmed as a punishment & he may be transferred from ... the. Dt.

21) One Ramdas was appointed by the Govt along with them Steers in 1981 and was prior to it for 15 yrs in a Sandal oil factory. The Sub Magistrate acknowledges that he has a clean record. He was over 8 yrs in service as the Asst Inspector & gave no room for complaint.....

22) As regards the evidence the following points deserve note

The only evidence of delay in issuing permits is that of one Md Sait & his clerks. They were cross examined & they

Speaks to his having perused some points for scrutiny before passing the lorry and till that is done they may not take some any question of delay

23) As regards illegal gratification based upon some expenditure items in books it may not be of much use because as one of the time whose upon books contained such entries has explained that the amount indicates some personal items of expenditure (vide evidence of Sethagiriayya and Narayanababu)

24) Further on 22-4-35 one more Ram Singh lorry owner has produced his accounts. No such entries were detected in his books. (Vide pages 18 & 19 of the Records) The more especially since a number of lorry owners were similarly issued but no such accounts seem to have been produced

25) As regards the evidence of Mrs. Rahim Bee it may be said that as explained by one Ramudu the person had

no reason to get to him as his boats had been examined long ago and with rafees

Form 1677

A

26) On a complaint petition dated 13.4.35 from Mr: Ali Mahomed Sait and another dated 14 april 1935 from Mr K. Seetharamia of K.M.S. Ananda motor Service the Dt supdt Shimoga, placed the Bus Inspector Mr Pantalu under Suspension from 16 april 1935 and directed an enquiry by the Personal asst.

'B'

27) Mr: Ali Sait's only charge against the Inspector made in his petition was that the Inspector without sufficient reasons delayed the grant of brake certificate in respect of Lorry No: Myc 5752 even though it was passed as fit on 10th april 1935; Mr: Seetharamia's charge was that on 27.2.35 the Inspector received illegal gratification of Rs 10/- from the Complainants' clerk and that the Inspector has been demanding similar gratification at the rate of Rs 5/- per bus.

28) The enquiring Officer in pursuance of the Dt supdt's orders, sent for the account books of several other bus owners and finding two suspicious entries in the books of Gajanana motor services and the M.C. motor

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

motor Service, sent for the proprietors and clerks of these services and after examining them framed another additional charge against the Inspector of receiving on 6-2-1935 an illegal gratification of Rs 10/- from one Rahim Beig of the V/S motor Service - No charge was framed in respect of the Gajanana Service because its proprietor in his statement explained the entry as not referring to the Bus Inspector at all -

29) As regards one Ali Saib's charge of delay in issuing the brake certificate for his lorry No: S 752, the Ali Saib's evidence in the matter is of no practical value because he speaks nothing from his personal knowledge but only states what he has been told by his clerks. It was this clerk S.V. Subbarao that took the lorry for inspection on the 10th April and it is clear from his evidence itself that the Bus Inspector could not have wholly approved the vehicle that day. He admits the Inspector remarking about the feebleness of the brakes in the old brake certificate itself and his statement that the Inspector finally approved the vehicle & promised to issue the certificate - -

without further inspection the next day stands uncorroborated though he says that many persons were present at the time. It is also very significant that though the other complainant mr: Seetharamia has charged the Inspector with taking illegal gratification, neither mr: Ali Sait nor his two clerks say anything about the Inspector delaying the issue of the brake certificate for their not giving him "the necessary mamool".

30) The written statement of 21st may 1935 filed by the Inspector, I think, gives a very satisfactory explanation of the delay so called for the issue of the ~~brake~~ brake certificate in respect of this lorry. The enquiring officer does not seem to have given any consideration for this explanation. But from the penultimate para of his report, it is seen that it is only in respect of the charges regarding illegal gratification that the enquiry officer has given his findings and that therefore it may be presumed that he himself was not prepared to attach much weight to the complaint of mr: Ali Sait.

31) Now coming to mr: Seetharamia's complaint which forms the subject matter of the 2nd charge in this case, in the complaint petition of 14th april 1935, mr: Seetharamaya

L.

But the Dr. Nagar says there are other instances of delay in issue of certificates by IPM.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

Says that recently he came to Shimoga and on going through the bus accounts found an entry showing ~~that~~ a payment of Rs 10/- to the Inspector on 27-2-1935. A careful examination of this petition (Ex. B) indicates that the whole petition has been written and signed by Mr. Seetharamappa in one ink while the date "27-2-1935" in the body is in another ink. In the extract of accounts taken on 16-4-35 but certified by nobody the entry is under "28-2-35 ಸೀತಾರಾಮಪ್ಪನವರು ರೂ॥ ಮಾತ್ರ.." and the heading for the entry is "ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್". The entry itself is as follows:—

52) ನಂ. ಜಿಎಲ್ ಎಸ್ ಬಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಎಳಸಿಗೆ ಬಳಿ 0-3-0
ಶಿವಪ್ಪಗೌಡ್ರಿಗೆ 0-2-0 ಕೊಂಡ ಎಸ್ ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ 0-5-0
ಇವನಿಗೆ ಇನ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರವರಿಗೆ 10/-/0 ಕೊಟ್ಟ — 10-5-0.

The repetition of "ಕೊಟ್ಟ" shows that the total has been struck twice and it is worth some notice that this important fact of payment of Rs 10-0-0 to the Inspector comes after the first two items, by themselves insignificant are ~~totalled~~ totalled.

32) There is nothing in the records to show if the enquiring officer examined personally at least the original account book of this bus owner Mr. Seetharamappa. He was examined on 25-4-1935 and the order sheet of that

clay though it speaks of ~~the~~ the account books of other bus owners being examined, is silent about mr: Seetharamappa's.

33) Again there is a material discrepancy between what is stated in the complaint-petition of mr: Seetharamappa and the evidence he gave on 25/4/35. In the petition, ~~he says that a certificate for the year 1933~~ he says he examined the accounts on his coming to Shimoga and it is made to appear as if this examination was done in its usual course and not with a view to find out payments of illegal gratification said to have been made to the Inspector by his clerk. The evidence ~~of the~~ given on 25/4/35 is different. There it is seen that for not getting the brake certificate for mys 4207, the clerk told ~~him~~ mr: Seetharamappa that the certificate was not issued since the maamool was not paid & that thereafter mr: Seetharamappa looked into the accounts and found this entry of 27-2-1935.

But this is referred to in his petn at 17 supra

34) In the written statement, the bus Inspector says that all the Certificates in respect of the buses of this service were issued before 27.2.1935 and that mr: Seetharamappa's clerk Anandarao who it is that speaks to this payment was found unreliable & suspended by mr: Seetharamappa himself. On a consideration of all

The materials, I think, it is a very flimsy case that is made out in respect of the 2nd charge and it would be quite unjust to rely on the evidence produced to bring home this very serious offence to the Inspector -

3 s) Regarding the third charge, one cannot express feeling that the person making the charge is almost induced to make it. Mr Rahim Beig says he paid on 6-2-1935. Here again the records do not contain even an extract of the account book. The clerk M. K. Pillai is examined first and he says that on page 15 of the account, the entry is as follows:-

"Mr Rahim Beig, Bus Inspector,
Dattathri Naik, in cover."

Mr. Pillai says that he learnt from Mr. Naik that he paid Rs 10/- to Mr Rahim Beig for the Bus Inspector and therefore made the entry as above. Mr. Rahim Beig gives evidence after he learns what his clerk has said and he says that he gave Rs 10/- to the Inspector on 6.2.1935 in open office !!.. Mr. Naik then gives evidence after hearing what his master has deposed. In this connection objection statement filed on the 8th by the Bus Inspector speaks volumes for the way in which this

Enquiry has been conducted - special reference is invited to the paragraph marked 'F' (on page 38 of the papers) of this statement - The allegations made therein are serious and it is a pity that the enquiry officer does not say anything about them. The evidence of Rahim Beig & his two clerks ~~[illegible]~~ itself however ~~[illegible]~~ corroborates these allegations -

36) Against these, there is the fact that many of these bus owners & their accounts have been examined by the enquiry officer and they have made no allegations of corruption against the Inspector. The Dist mgte, (Mr: Iswaran) himself says in his report of 5th June that this Inspector has put in "a service of 20 years and also has an unblemished record in the past". He served in mysore for over 3 years without giving room for any complaint.

37) Under these circumstances, I do not think the Inspector deserved the punishment of suspension from 16·4·35 to 30·5·35 ordered by the Dt mgte and recommended by him to be confirmed as a specific punishment. His transfer from Shimoga may perhaps be considered when the question of the transfer of the Bangalore Bus Inspector is taken up as ordered in the linked file, in Oct 1935. If the suspension order is cancelled, perhaps

the period has to be treated as privilege or other kind of leave that the Inspector may be entitled to under the M.S.R.

Submitted for orders

(Gen Secy) JRP 29.7.35

b) The portion of the last para of the DC's report on Page 4 sums up his finding; and it is seen from this that the work of the Poss Insp^r. has not been satisfactory; though I am inclined to regard the specific acts of corruption alleged as "not proved" x) agree therefore with the DC's recommn.

I Minute

ltm 13-8-35

x x) Think the DC is also of this opinion as otherwise the punishment he has recommended is certainly not adequate

ltm

pnl 1-8-35

40) Papers and the Secy's memo re myself same to me

16/8

ltm 16/8

41) Draft pnl 16/8

GENERAL REGISTRY 30 JULY 1935 765

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MINISTER No. 1174

DEPT. 2 JUL 1935

Kenaf-Embroidery cottons are solicited re the discussion of the Inspector.

pm 16/8

43) For favourable consideration & orders re transfer of Inspector

(Gen Secy)

(44) Re transfer matter may be taken up at A on the previous page. Dft Appd ltm 21/8

PUBLICITY OFFICE.

ABSTRACT OF NEWSPAPER INTELLIGENCE.
30th April 1935.

Date.....

WD 229—GPB—2,000—29-8-34

Heading of article	Name of newspaper, date and page	Subject
India Bill Princes Satisfied.	"Hindu" 29-4-1935.	According to a Reuter's message from London, "The Daily Telegraph" states that there has been an important development concerning the India Bill during the recess. As a result of consultations between counsel for various Indian States in London as well as conversations between personal representatives of some States and the India Office Officials a satisfactory understanding regarding the Federation has been reached. "The Telegraph" adds that a plain and decisive statement of the attitude of the Indian States will be issued in a few days showing that in view of the amendments which Sir S. Hoare intends to introduce, the doubts about acceptance of a Federation have been cleared away and the States will give full support to the measure in its promised form.
Mr. K.V. Anantaraman will be appointed as Chief Secretary to Government.	-do-	The paper's Bangalore correspondent says that Mr. K.V. Anantharaman, Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, will be appointed Chief Secretary to Government when Mr. R. Ranga Rao avails himself of leave for 2 months from the 3rd week of May preparatory to retirement.
Mr. Babu Rajendra Prasad to come to Bangalore on the 6th May.	-do-	According to the revised programme Mr. Babu Rajendra Prasad arrives in Bangalore on the 6th May from Bellary

Commissioner of Scotland Yard.

Daily Post. 29-4-35.

According to "Reuter" Sir John Anderson is mentioned as the likeliest successor of Lord Trenchard, who relinquishes the Commissionership of Scotland Yard before the end of the year.

Lecturing at the National Institute of Physical Education, Shankarpuram on "Radio as a Career" Mr. K. Srinivasan of the Indian Institute of Science said that Broadcasting had a definite social function to perform and that a nationwide radio broadcasting would serve as a most valuable medium for national reconstruction.

Submitted for favour of perusal.

Ch Sec'y

WP
30/4

Rec
1/5/35

That about A

WP
1/5

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. P 16/66

Dated, Bangalore, 3rd May *193*5.

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for a report an extract from the Navajivana Newspaper dated 29th April 1935 regarding the suspension of the Bus Inspector of Shimoga on an alleged charge of corruption.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government.

Newspaper Abstract - Shimoga News - Navajivana 29-4-1935.

"Learns that the Bus Inspector, Shimoga, has been suspended on a charge of corruption and wants to know the truth of this fact. Requests the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga, to make detailed investigation in this affair."

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 4/5/35

Signed by .....

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by... .....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No. D. 6166

To

The Dy Comr. Shimoga.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for a ~~very early~~ a report an extract from the ~~Hi~~ Navajivana Newspapaper dated 29.4.35 regarding the suspension of the Pass Inspector of Shimoga on an alleged charge of corruption.

I have etc.

for Gen. Secy

3.5.35

Here enter Extract marked 'A'

× × × × ×

WD 01956—GPB—22,590—12-6-34

No. A4.P....182/34-35.
Enc: 1 file as per photist

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
SHIMOGA DISTRICT.

Dated Shimoga, ...June 4.... .....1935.

Legis 25-31-1.

FROM

T. V. A. ISVARAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

To

Early
7/6/35

H.V. RAMASWAMI, ESQ., M.A., B.L.,
General Secretary to Government,
Bangalore.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No. P. 6166/Legis. dated 3/4th May 1935 forwarding an extract from Navajivana Newspaper dated 29th April 1935 regarding the suspension of the Bus Inspector of this District on the alleged charges of corruption and calling for report thereon, I have the honour to state as follows:--

1) Complaints of inordinate delay on the part of the Bus Inspector in the issue of fitness certificates in respect of Motor Venicles licensed to run for hire and his having received illegal gratification from some of the Bus Owners having been received from the marginally noted persons on 16-4-1935 a departmental enquiry was instituted keeping the Bus Inspector under suspension pending enquiry into misconduct. The enquiry was conducted by my Personal Assistant who was also authorized to examine some of the Bus Owners other than the complaints regarding the allegation of corruption. The records of enquiry made by him together with a breif summary of evidence recorded is herewith enclosed for reference.

1. Mr. Ali Sait, General Merchant and owner of Lorry No. Mys. 5752, Shimoga.
2. Mr. K. Sitharamappa, Proprietor, K.M.S. Ananda Motor Service, Shimoga.

2) In their statements before the enquiry Officer, Mr. Ali Sait, his clerks Subba Rao and Anantaramaiengar have stated that the lorry of Mr. Ali Sait was produced for inspection and issue of Brake Certificate on 10-4-1935, that on the assurance and

promise made by the Bus Inspector in the presence of a large number of persons present on the occasion, that the certificate would be issued the next day, it was brought again accordingly but the Brake Certificate was not issued for three successive days and on the 13th the lorry was required to be produced once again for inspection and that this delay in issuing brake certificate has caused considerable inconvenience and dislocation of work. Another person Mr. Sitaramappa and his clerk Ananda Rao, have spoken to the fact that in connection with the inspection of their buses during the last quarter, the Bus Inspector demanded a mamool of Rs 5/- for every bus examined, that Rs 10/- was thus paid on 27th February 1935, that on production of their buses for inspection during the March Quarter, the Bus Inspector demanded the balance of the amount due for the previous quarter in addition to the mamool for the current quarter. Similarly Mr. Rahim Beig the Proprietor of Y.S. Service has spoken to the payment of mamool to the Bus Inspector on 6-2-1935.. The account books of the above two services which were secured and examined contain unambiguous entries of such payments and corroborate the oral statements made by the above persons.

3) In his explanation in respect of the charges framed against him, the Bus Inspector has stated that the lorry of Mr. Ali Sait when brought for inspection was found to be defective in two ways viz., that the rear wheels were tight and that the Hand Brake required adjustment, that only the former defect was rectified and as the latter was not attended to, he did not pass it. The Bus Inspector has stated that he has been insisting upon a thorough examination of the vehicles before issuing certificate which the Bus Owners dislike and that the present complaint is the outcome of a desire to malign him and bring him into trouble. He has added that Ananda Rao, Clerk of the K.M.S. Motor Service is a thoroughly unreliable person who must have pocketed the amount alleged to have been paid to him and to conceal his fraud engineer-

engineered the explanation of illicit gratification to Bus Inspector. He has further added that there was no necessity for Mr. Rahim Beig either to pay or for the Bus Inspector to receive payment of illegal gratification as his buses were granted certificates much earlier than the date of alleged payment.

4) In the first place, it may be seen that the defects alleged to have been discovered by the Bus Inspector in the lorry of Mr. Ali Sait cannot be considered as defects at all disqualifying the vehicles from service. The lorry in question is ascertained to have been purchased only a year and a half ago. It had been brought for inspection held by me, the Executive Engineer and the other local officers and the previous Bus Inspector in June 1934 and found to be in very good condition and the G & H Permits are current till the end of June 1935. If the present Bus Inspector found the lorry unsound and unfit for service, he should have made a report and sought instructions from me. But he has failed to do so for obvious reasons. There are also other instances in which the issue of fitness certificates have been delayed even after the necessary fees were credited to the Treasury and the vehicles were examined. The charge of corruption is not only spoken to by the Bus Owners and other persons connected with Bus Services but is evidenced by entries in the Account Books. The Bus Inspector was given a fair opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses who have spoken against him but he has failed to avail himself fully of the opportunity, pleading inability to do so without the aid of a Counsel, The oral testimony and entries in the Account Books remain unchallenged by the Bus Inspector. There is merely the bare denial of the allegations made against him and imputing them to ill-will towards him because of his strictness in the discharge of his duties. The Bus Owners who have complained are all respectable persons and their statements which remain unimpeached, corroborated by entries in the Account Books maintained

i

rate this much has to be said that the Bus Inspector has given room for complaints of a serious nature after coming to this District and in view of the fact stated above it cannot be that it is altogether without any foundation. He has also been negligent in not attending Office when he was in Head Quarters and in not submitting reports of inspections made by him from time to time. But I see that he has put in a service of 20 years and also has an unblemished record in the past. In this case he has been already under suspension from 16-4-1935 to 30-5-1935. Though his conduct has been highly blameworthy yet in view of his long service and previous good record, I think it will be sufficient if the period of suspension is confirmed as a specific punis ment and that he might be given a chance to improve himself in future. I also recommend that he may be transferred from this District.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

4/6/35

Deputy Commissioner,
Shimoga District.

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Legis

File No. 25-34

Serial No. 11

Diary No. of letter replied to ....

No. P 7000/Exe Records 18 July

To The Commr
The Dt magte Shimoga

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Sir,

With refee to your letter no. A/4 P 182/34-35 dt 4/5.6.35 regarding the suspension of the Bus Inspector of the Shimoga Dist, I am directed to state that the brief summary of evidence recorded referred to in para 2 of the above letter has not been received and which may kindly be forwarded does not appear to have been sent.

Since it is said to have been held in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the public Servants' Conduct Rules, I am to request the Confidential report of the enquiry and the findings of the enquiring

Date of issue 18/6/35

Signed by .....

List of enclosures .....

Copied by 18/6/35

officer on each of the article
of charge ~~have also to be~~ be sent which he has to give
~~sent~~ as per para 228 of the
manual of Govt. Ins of S.O.S (part I 1931 Edn). ~~The~~
~~which may kindly be forwarded furnished now~~.
~~The entire records are necessary~~ reference
The enclosures to your ~~above letter~~ under are returned
~~returned for necessary~~ ~~have with for return~~
for resubmission together with the information now called for

Thanks

MP
18/6
for Govt ~~Servt~~
18/6/35

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. D-7000 Title of Receipt

Dated, Bangalore, 18th June 1935

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate,
Shimoga District.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.A.4-P.182/34-35 dated 4/5th June 1935 regarding the ~~Inspection~~ Suspension of the Bus Inspector of the Shimoga District, I am directed to state that the brief summary of evidence recorddd, referred to in para 2 of the above letter does not appear to have been sent. Since the enquiry is said to have been held in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the Public Servants' Conduct Rules, I am to enquire about the confidential report of the enquiry and the findings of the enquiring officer on each of the articles of charge which he has to give as per para 228 of the Manual of General Circulars and Standing Orders (Part I, 1931 Edn).

The enclosures to your letter under reference are returned herewith for resubmission together with the information now called for.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

MRL 18/6

for General Secretary to Government.

B.K.M.2

7477/34

D. O. No. A.4.P.182/34-35. Encs:

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
SHIMOGA DISTRICT.

Dated Shimoga, ...28th June, ...*193* 5.

Confidential.

From

S. Narayana Rao, Esq., M.A.,(Hons)
Deputy Commissioner and District Magistrate,
Shimoga.

To

H. V. Ramaswami, Esq., M.A.,B.L.,
General Secretary to Government,
Bangalore.

Re: Bus Inspector, Shimoga.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No: 7000/Legis.25-34-II dated 18th/19th June 1935, regarding the Bus Inspector of this District, I have the honour to enclose herein a copy of the brief summary of evidence recorded by the Enquiring Officer for favour of perusal. It is the same as the Confidential report of the enquiring Officer and contains the findings on each of the allegations.

2. The enclosures received with your letter under reference are all retransmitted herewith.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

S. Narayana Rao

Deputy Commissioner & District Magistrate.

Subject:--

Complaint petitions dated the 16th April 1935 filed by Messrs. Ali Mahamad Sait, owner of Lorry No: MYS.5752, Shimoga and K. Seetharamappa, Proprietor, K.M.S.Ananda Motor Service, Nagar alleging that Mr. Panthalu, the Bus Inspector of this District has been delaying the issue of Brake certificates for reasons best known to himself that he has been receiving illegal gratification from Bus owners and that he is generally corrupt.

(A)

- - - - - -

As per order, enquiries were made by me into the allegations contained in the above petitions. The petitioners Ali Sait and Seetharamappa were examined on 24-4-35 and their statements recorded. It is seen therefrom that their petitions are based on the information given by their clerks. S.N.Subba Rao, Clerk of Ali Sait who was examined states that lorry No: MYS.5752 belonging to his Sowcar Ali Sait was according to his (Ali Sait's) instructions, taken to the Bus Inspector on 10-4-35 afternoon, for examination and issue of a brake certificate, that it was examined by the Bus Inspector on the same day, that certain defects pointed out by him were rectified then and there and that on re-examination the Bus Inspector passed it and promised to issue a brake certificate the next day in the presence of many people assembled there. He further states tha on three successive days he sent the second clerk Anantharama Iyengar to fetch the brake certificate promised to be issued by the Bus Inspector, but on the 13t.. April 1935 Anantharamaiengar informed him that the Bus Inspector refused to grant the certificate and required the lorry to be produced for inspection once again. Anantharamaiengar supports the statement of Subba Rao.

C D E F

Ananda Rao, Clerk of Mr. Seetharamappa deposes that in January last the four buses owned by the company were produced for examination and issue of brake certificate. The Bus Inspector demanded his mamool at the rate of rupees five for every bus examined, that he postponed payment for some time, that on 27-2-35 as the Bus Inspector pressed for payment he paid a sum of Rs. 10/- and charged it in the accounts. In April last when his proprietor Seetharamappa came to Shimoga he took one of the Company's buses for obtaining a brake certificate for the March quarter. The Inspector would not pass the bus unless the balance due to him for the previous quarter was paid in addition to his mamool for the March Quarter. This he informed to the Proprietor who took objection to the payment made in February and ordered to him to desist from such course of action in future and punished him for the payment already made.

The account book of some of the other bus Proprietors were also obtained and examined as per orders passed on Seetharamappa's application dated the 16th April 1935 with a view to verify whether there were any other instance of such corrupt practice on the part of the Bus Inspector. The examination of the account books reveals a suspicious entry and a clear entry of payment of illegal gratification to the Bus Inspector in the accounts of book of the Gajanana and Y.S. Motor Services on 6-2-1935. The Proprietor of the Gajanana Motor Service Mr. Seshagiriappa was examined on 3rd May 1935 and the entry in question was pointed out to him. He states that the entry in question is an item of expenditure incurred on his own account when he took his bus for examination before the Bus Inspector in Sagar and Thirthahalli camps and does not mean anything else. But as far as the entry in the account of the Y.S Service is concerned Rahim Beig, Proprietor of the service admits the genuinness of the entry and states that the item of expenditure in question is in respect of a mamool given to the Bus Inspector.

In view of the above facts brought to light the following charges were framed and a copy of it was furnished to the Bus Inspector and he was called upon to furnish his explanation in regard to the charges:--

(1) "That you without sufficient reasons delayed the grant of brake certificate in respect of Lorry No: MYS.5752 owned by Mr. Ali Sait for the current quarter even though it was passed fit by you on the 10th April 1935.

(2) That you on 27-2-35 received illegal gratification of Rs. 10/- from one Ananda Rao, Clerk, K.M.S Ananda Motor Service for granting brake certificate for the several buses owned by the company and that you are demanding illegal gratification at the rate of Rs.5/- for each bus to grant brake certificate.

(3) That on 6-2-35, you received illegal gratification of Rs. 10/- from Mr. Rahim Beig, Proprietor of Y.S. Motor Service for passing his buses and granting brake certificates.

The Bus Inspector filed a written statement in respect of the charges framed against him on 21-5-1935. In regard to the complaint of Mr. Ali Sait, he explains that, based as it is on the information given by his clerk, it cannot be considered as true as he did not care to verify the facts given out

o him. As regards Ananda Rao, the Bus Inspector states that he is a horoughly undesirable and unreliable man who must have pocketted the money lleged to have been given to him (the Bus Inspector) and to conceal his raud he must have explained to his Proprietor that it was an amount paid to the is Inspector. In respect of the third charge, it is explained that the buses f Rahim Beig has been passed and brake certificates issued long before the lleged payment and that in the circumstances there was no necessity either for ahim Beig to pay or for the Bus Inspector to receive any illegal gratification rom Mr. Rahim Beig. It is further stated by the Bus Inspector that ever since e came to this place, he is insisting on a thorough examination of the buses efore passing them which the Bus onwers did not like and the present complaints re the out-come of the desire to malign him because he was strict in the discharge of his duties.

The Bus Inspector was given an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses ho have complained against him and also to examine witnesses, if any, on his ehalf. He has not availed himself of the opportunity to cross examine any of he complainants and states that he is unable to do so without the aid of a counel. He has also not examined any persons on his behalf and he states that here are none such.

From the above, it is seen that the charge of corruption ~~are~~ is not only poken to by Bus Owners and other persons connected with Bus Services but is videnced by entries in the account books. The orgal statements and the entries in the account books remain unchallenged by the Bus Inspector except by a bare denial of the allegations made against him, imputing it to the ill-will the Bus owners against him on account of his being very strict in the discharge of his duties.

The character book of the official and the account books referred to above are submitted for orders.

Submitted.

(Intd) Y.S.
26-5-1935.

"Copy"

Deputy Commissioner and
District Magistrate.

24-6-1935.

G. R. S. App. F VI—G 2]

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Diary. No of letter replied to .....

Section Legis

File No. 25-34

Serial No. 12

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Date of issue..... 193

Signed by .....

Read—

Correspondence ending with letter No A.4.P.182/34-35 dt 28.6.1935 from the Dy Commr & Dist Surgeon dt reporting that on account of certain allegations of corruption & neglect of duty brought to his notice, ~~against~~ the Asst Inspector of Fcty dt has been directed to be suspended from 16.4.1935 & that the allegations having been examined, it was found that ~~Sriniva~~ The ~~charges~~

May this be—

(i) printed ?

(ii) treated as a standing order ?

(iii) published in the Gazette, English Part ?

(iv) translated ?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press ?

(vi) published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

~~Order thereon.—No.~~

~~Q. has been not proved~~

~~yet~~ The Pass Inspector had given room for complaints of a serious nature & had also been negligent in discharge of his duties ~~and had consequently~~ he was ~~ordered~~ to his ~~place on 30-5-1935~~ and ~~reporting~~ Starting has having regard to his past undetermined record it was an sufficient in the period of suspension from 16-4-35 to 30-5-35 is confirmed as a specific punishment & ~~to~~ the other ~~might be~~ given as above to improve himself and recommending the transfer of the Inspector from the Dr. ~~Inspectorate~~

List of Enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

Govt consider that the specific acts of corruption alleged have not been proved. The recommendations of the Dy Commissioner is approved as the work of the Inspector has not been satisfactory.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

Read:-

Correspondence ending with letter No. A4.P.182/34-35 dated 28th June 1935. from the Deputy Commissioner & District Magistrate, Shimoga District, reporting that on account of certain allegations of corruption and neglect of duty brought to his notice, the Sub Inspector of the District had to be suspended from 16th April 1935 to 30th May 1935, that the allegations having been examined, it was found that the Sub Inspector had given room for complaints of a serious nature and had also been negligent in the discharge of his duties and stating that having regard to his past unblemished record, it will be sufficient if the period of suspension from 16th April 1935 to 30th May 1935 is confirmed as a specific punishment and the officer given a chance to improve himself and recommending the transfer of the Inspector from the District.

Order No. P 1&4 80-32/Regn 25-34-12

Dated Bangalore, 26th August 1935.

Though it cannot be said that the specific acts of corruption alleged have been satisfactorily proved yet having regard to the fact that the work of the Sub Inspector in the District has been reported upon adversely, Government are pleased to approve of the recommendation made by the Deputy Commissioner.

Separate orders will be passed regarding the transfer of the Sub Inspector from the District.

for General Secretary to Govt.

The Deputy Commissioner & Dist. Magistrate,
Shimoga District,
The Comptroller to Government.
The Director of Industries & Commerce in Mysore.